



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/555,233	07/13/2000	AKITOSHI KOJIMA	P-9904 S	1035
28752	7590	10/03/2007	EXAMINER	
LACKENBACH SIEGEL, LLP			MOORTHY, ARAVIND K	
LACKENBACH SIEGEL BUILDING			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1 CHASE ROAD			2131	
SCARSDALE, NY 10583			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/03/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/555,233	KOJIMA, AKITOSHI
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Aravind K. Moorthy	2131

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 July 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 12-16 is/are pending in the application.
  - 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 12-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 25 May 2000 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

## **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This is in response to the arguments filed on 24 July 2007.
2. Claims 12-16 are pending in the application.
3. Claims 12-16 have been rejected.
4. Claims 1-11 have been cancelled.

### *Response to Arguments*

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 12-16 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. **Claims 12-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lager et al U.S. Patent No. 6,636,502 B1.**

As to claim 12, Lager et al discloses a network system comprising:

individual service provider devices each having a first authentication server and access point terminals to which user terminals of users who contract a corresponding one of the individual service provider devices are connected, the access point terminals connecting the user terminal to a network [column 11, lines 44-59];

a parallel service provider device connected to the network and the individual service provider devices, the parallel service provider device having a roaming contract with the individual service provider devices and including a second authentication server and no access point terminal [column 11 line 60 to column 12 line 6]; and

wherein each of the individual service provider devices comprises:

determining means for determining whether a user who issues a connection request from a user terminal connected to one of the access point terminals is a contracted member of the parallel service provider device [column 12 line 66 to column 13 line 19];

transmitting means for transmitting the connection request to the parallel service provider device to cause the second authentication server of the parallel services provider device to perform user authentication when the user is the contracted member [column 16, lines 33-55];

authentication means for causing the first authentication server of the individual service provider devices to perform user authentication when the user is not the contracted member [column 16, lines 33-55]; and

connecting means for connecting the user terminal connected to one of the access point terminals to the network and charging the user for connection when a result of user authentication is good [column 14, lines 49-63].

As to claim 14, Lager et al discloses that the parallel service provider device is connected to the individual service provider devices through an exclusive line [column 11, lines 17-24].

As to claim 15, Lager et al discloses that the individual service provider devices send respective user connection logs to the parallel service provider device [column 17, lines 19-39].

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

**7. Claims 13 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lager et al U.S. Patent No. 6,636,502 B1 as applied to claim 12 above, and further in view of Liu et al U.S. Patent No. 5,898,780.**

As to claim 13, Lager et al does not teach that the connection request comprises an e-mail address including a domain name of the parallel service provider device. Lager et al does not teach that the determining means determines whether the user is a contracted member based on the presence or absence of the domain name of the parallel service provider device in the connection request.

Liu et al teaches that the connection request comprises an e-mail address including a domain name of the parallel service provider device [column 3, lines 47-67]. Liu et al teaches that the determining means determines whether the user is a contracted member based on the presence or absence of the domain name of the parallel service provider device in the connection request [column 3, lines 47-67].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Lager et al so that in addition to a user ID the connection request would have comprised an e-mail address including a domain name of the parallel service provider device. It would have been determined whether the user was a contracted member based on the presence or absence of the domain name of the parallel service provider device in the connection request.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Lager et al by the teaching of Liu et al because this provides the advantage that a plurality of authentication servers from a plurality of local ISP's can utilize a single routing server. This provides the advantage that only the routing server needs to be updated with revised information about one or more home ISP's [column 1, lines 49-63].

As to claim 16, Lager et al discloses receiving means for receiving a user name for a user terminal of a user who requests a signup [column 16, lines 41-55].

Lager et al does not teach further determining means for determining whether e-mail addresses including a combination of the input user name and sub-domains of the parallel service provider device has been registered so as to register one of non-registered e-mail addresses.

Liu et al teaches determining means for determining whether e-mail addresses including a combination of the input user name and sub-domains of the parallel service provider device has been registered so as to register one of non-registered e-mail addresses [column 3, lines 47-67].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Lager et al so that there would have been means for determining whether e-mail addresses included a combination of the input user name and

Art Unit: 2131

sub-domains of the parallel service provider device had been registered so as to register one or non-registered e-mail addresses.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Lager et al by the teaching of Liu et al because this provides the advantage that a plurality of authentication servers from a plurality of local ISP's can utilize a single routing server. This provides the advantage that only the routing server needs to be updated with revised information about one or more home ISP's [column 1, lines 49-63].

Art Unit: 2131

***Conclusion***

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Aravind K. Moorthy whose telephone number is 571-272-3793. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz R. Sheikh can be reached on 571-272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Aravind K Moorthy  
September 27, 2007

  
AYAZ SHEIKH  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100